

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

ENITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/699,330	10/31/2003	Paul A. Kohl	062020-1540	2552
24504	7590 03/29/2005		EXAMINER	
THOMAS, I	KAYDEN, HORSTEME	LE, HOA VAN		
100 GALLER	IA PARKWAY, NW			
STE 1750			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
ATLANTA, GA 30339-5948			1752	

DATE MAILED: 03/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Commission	10/699,330	KOHL ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Hoa V. Le	1752			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE.	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status		•			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 J	anuary 2005.				
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)☐ This	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.				
,					
closed in accordance with the practice under I	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-7 and 11-31 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-31 is/are withdray 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-7.11 and 13 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 12 is/are objected to. 8) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-7 and 11-31 are subject to restriction	wn from consideration.				
Application Papers		•			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 October 2003 is/are Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	: a)⊠ accepted or b)☐ objected drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See tion is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•				
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s)	🗖				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4)				
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	T	atent Application (PTO-152)			

20050323

Application/Control Number: 10/699,330 Page 2

Art Unit: 1752

This is in response to Paper filed on 31 January 2005.

I. The record additionally shows that applicants, Georgia Tech Research Corp. and their counsels do not comply with Rule 37 CFR 1.56 (a) and (b), especially with the prosecutions of application serial Nos. 10/135,314 (later 10/734,075 now USP 6,788,867 showing Georgia tech Research Corp. as assignee) 10/686,697 and this application.

- II. The record in application Serial No. 10/686,697 and the instant application does not disclose an assignee. It is a reason for calling. Telephone call was made to Ms. Cynthia J. Lee On 23 March 2005 at about 11:30 AM. She was not at her desk. I massage to her is made. Second telephone call was made at about 1:00 PM. It was told that she has left for the day.
- III. An amendment request is filed on 31 January 2005. Applicants also request that the applied references in the rejections on the record are withdrawn in view of the amendment. It has been carefully considered, studied and found to be convincing.
- IV. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground

provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

It is assumed that the application Serial No. 10/686,697 and the instant application have the same ownership.

Accordingly, claims 1-7, 11 and 13 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 3-4, 7 and 10 as amended on 05 November 2004 of copending Application No. 10/686,697 (Pub. No.: US 2004/0132855). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because (1) the applied language "photodefinable polymer" is broadly enough to encompass "poly... carbonate" in the instant claims and (2) the applied language "photoinitiator" is broadly enough to encompass "photoacid generator..." in the instant claims. Please also see Pub. No.: US 2004/0132855 at paragraphs [0036], [0040]

The functional properties of the materials in claims 2-7 are reasonably considered to be inherent since the same composition would provide the same property in the absence of an evidence to the contrary. For the properties of the materials, the court allows to request and require applicants to provide convincing evidence to the contrary in accordance with the authority stated in In re Schreiber, 44 USPQ2d 1429.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

V. Claim 12 is objected to because it is depended on the rejected claim 1.

Art Unit: 1752

VI. The counsel is requested disclose the ownership of application 10/862,759 (2004/0248034) and the instant application for a proper action between them and/or with USP 6,788,867 being assigned to Georgia Tech Research Corp.

VII. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

VIII. This application contains claims 14-31 are drawn to an invention nonelected with traverse in Paper filed on 13 September 2004. A complete reply to the final rejection must include cancellation of nonelected claims or other appropriate action (37 CFR 1.144) See MPEP § 821.01.

Application/Control Number: 10/699,330 Page 5

Art Unit: 1752

IX. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hoa V. Le whose telephone number is 571-272-1332.

The examiner can normally be reached from 6:30 AM to 4:30 PM on Monday though Thursday

and about the same time of most Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Cynthia Kelly can be reached on 571-272-1526.

Applicants may file a paper by (1) fax with a central facsimile receiving number 703-

872-9306. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hoa V. Le Primary Examiner

Art Unit 1752

HVL

23 March 2005.

HOA VAN LE PRIMARY.EXAMINER